

REMARKS

[0001] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 26-31, 41, 43-45, 51, 55, 57-59 and 67 are currently pending
- Claims 2-25, 32-40, 42, 46-50, 52-54, 56, 60-66 and 68-70 are withdrawn herein
- Claims 1, 27, 41, and 59 are amended herein

Allowed Claims

[0002] The Office Action indicates that claims 41, 43-45, 51, 55, 57, 58 and 67 are allowable. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 41, 43-45, 51, 55, 57, 58 and 67. Claim 41 is amended herein to correct minor informalities. Otherwise, these claims have not been amended, and therefore remain in condition for allowance.

[0003] The Office Action indicates that claim 59 would be allowable if applicant overcomes the 112, second paragraph rejection above. Applicant hereby amends claim 59, as shown above, to comply with the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment renders the § 112, second paragraph rejections moot and thus places claim 59 in condition for allowance.

Claim Objections

[0004] Claim 41 stands objected to because of minor informalities. Applicant has amended claim 41, as suggested by the Office. Applicant thanks the Office for the suggested amendment.

Claims 1, 26-31 and 59 Comply With § 112 Second Paragraph

[0005] Claims 1, 26-31 and 59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

[0006] Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without acquiescing in the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein amends claims 1, 27, and 59 as shown above. Claims 26-31 dependent from claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render the § 112, second paragraph rejections moot.

Cited Documents

[0007] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Viola: Viola, "Robust Real-Time Object Detection", 2nd Intl Workshop on Statistical and Computational Theories of Vision – Modeling, Learning, Computing and Sampling, July 2001.
- Wright Wright et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0088894.

- Ai: Ai, et al, "A Subspace Approach to Face Detection with Support Vector Machines", IEEE, 2002, pp 45-48.
- Rowley: Rowley et al., "Neural Network-Based Face Detection", PAME IEEE, January 1998, all pages.

§ 103 Rejections

[0008] Claims 1, 26, 28-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Viola in view of Wright and Ai and noted with Rowley. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0009] Without further comment or prejudice as to the merits of the Examiner's rejections, and without prejudice to the filing of subsequent continuation or divisional applications, Applicant hereby amends independent claim 1 to expedite the issuance of the subject matter acknowledged as being allowable by the Office. Specifically, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include, in part, subject matter presented in claim 41 that is indicated as allowable by the Office.

[0010] Applicant submits that these amendments thereby place independent claim 1 in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 26 and 28-31 dependent from independent claim 1. Thus, applicant submits that claims 1, 26, and 28-31 are in condition for allowance.

Allowed Claims

[0011] Claim 27 is objected to as depending from a rejected base claim. As noted above, Independent claim 1 is amended to expedite the issuance of the subject matter acknowledged as being allowable by the Office. Dependent claim 27 depends from Independent claim 1. In light of the above noted amendments to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 27 is now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

[0012] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant



Dated: 9/28/2009

Elizabeth J. Zehr
Registration No 64013
Reviewer: Damon J. Kruger
Registration No 60400